

THE POSITION OF PHRYGIAN

VLADIMIR E. OREL
TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY

Et Phrygio stimulat numero cava tibia mentis
Lucretius

To this day, the belief is widely held that Phrygian is a marginal and not quite reliable source of relevant linguistic information. A few phonological and morphological features of Phrygian are usually mentioned as definitely established (although even the dichotomy *centum*~*satəm* remains unsolved, cf. Kretschmer 1896, 229; Detschew 1960, 146 and a new attempt to prove its *satəm* character in Diakonoff, Neroznak 1985)¹ while the whole body of linguistic data one finds in Phrygian inscriptions is neglected.² It may be explained by the fact that Haas 1966, a pioneering effort opening up certain new possibilities, is, however, interspersed with mistakes and unhappy conjectures, (mainly explained by the poor quality and limited number of inscriptions published before 1984), while the last book on Phrygian, Diakonoff, Neroznak 1985, is a step back.

The whole picture has been changed by Brixhe, Lejeune 1984,

1, Phrygian is definitely a *centum* language, cf. OPhr. *keneman* (see below), *akenas* 'sepulchre, monument' Skt. *aśani-* 'sharp point', Gk. ἄκαινα, NPhr. μεκας 'big' ~ Arm *mec* 'id.', Gk. μέγας, 'id.' and the like. On the special treatment of **ghdh-*, **g^wdh-* see below.

2. The problem of the Phrygian glosses will not be discussed here.

an indispensable revision of the whole body of Old Phrygian inscriptions.³ This critical edition has greatly improved the very foundation of Old Phrygian studies. On the other hand, since Haas 1966, the paleography of New Phrygian texts has been satisfactory. A new linguistic interpretation (established reading, grammatical analysis, tentative translation and paleographic revision) has been recently suggested in Bayun, Orel 1988a,b.

My purpose here is twofold: first, to determine the limits of Phrygian in space and time, i.e., to indicate all the texts identifiable as Phrygian or written in dialects closely connected with Phrygian, and second, to describe the position of Phrygian within Indo-European or, more specifically, among the South-East Indo-European dialects (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Armenian, and, probably, some others), a group to which Phrygian is known to belong.

1. Limits of Phrygian

The list of Old Phrygian inscriptions codified in Brixhe, Lejeune 1984 is presently subject to considerable amendments. The inscriptions I claim to be Old Phrygian or to belong to local dialects of Old Phrygian are as follows:

(i) *Moesian inscription from Uyuchik* (see Friedrich 1932, 140-142; detailed analysis in Bayun, Orel 1988c). Suggested number E-01⁴ Found in *Phrygia Epictetus*, carved on a marble slab. Not

3. Here I follow the traditional distinction between Old Phrygian (8th - third centuries B.C.) and New Phrygian (first - third centuries A.D.).

4. The established pattern is kept here: letters indicate the localisation of the inscription (*B* - Bithynia, *C* - Central Phrygia, *DEd* - "Documents divers," *G* - Gordion, *M* - town of Midas, *P* -

earlier than fifth century B.C.

Transcription: (1) ...e ...y... (2)...[k]a...a[n]e...a... (3) [l]la[mn]lava[yd]okse[σ]a[σ]ioi (4) [--]a[d]llevasiya[g]lavoy[t.]e (5) [?]epaviy iσ.anev[t]levey (6) a[t]loiapnekro[iu]nbatan[te]) l ikes:brateraiσpatriy[iσ]iok.

Translation: "...⁵ will give the name to the people free of enemies and to the splendid assembly (?). (He) leaves the dead to Attis the Unjust and leaves a monument to (his) brothers and heirs."

Extremely close to Old Phrygian monuments *proprie dicta*, the text displays a few dialectical features, e.g., σ ~ Phrygian dentals before *i* (3d sg. pres. -σ ~ Old OPhr. -*ti*, dat. sg. aσioi ~ OPhr. adioi 'safe, free of enemies,' B-01, dat. pl. -aiσ, -oiσ ~ NPhr. -ουσι < *-oisi).

(ii) *Inscription on a seal from E. Herzfeld's collection* (see Haas 1966, 176; detailed analysis in Orel 1990a,b). Suggested number Dd-103. fourth - fifth centuries B.C. A figure of a king (or a priest) holding two lions and a non-alphabetic sign.

Transcription: (1) *mane* (2) *omen*. Presumably, *mane* is dat. sg. in -e < *-ei as in New Phrygian corresponding to a Phrygian royal name Μᾶνης. As to *omen*, it may be 3d pl. impf. in -en as in NPhr. (οπαδεν, N-69) related to Gk. ὅμνυμι 'swear, make an oath.' Tentative translation: "(They) swore an oath to Manes."

(iii) *Clay tablet from Persepolis* (see Haas 1966, 176; analyzed in Orel 1990a,b). Suggested number Pe-101. fifth - sixth centuries B.C. Transcription (interpunction replaced with blanks): (1)

Pteria, *T* - Tyana, *W* - West Phrygia), New Phrygian inscriptions have *N*-; lapidary inscriptions have numbers from 01 to 99, graffiti are numbered from 100.

5. The grammatical subject is presumably mentioned in line 2, of which only small fragments have survived.

[----]eke[s.../ (2) [---]eke[-]... (3) kna[--]... (4) ...[ass]i kna (-)ka... (5) make(-)es (6) (...) a (-) anamaka. Two fragments, [-]ka... (5) make[-]es... (6) [...]a[-]lanamaka. two fragments, kna[--] and kna[-]ka, may be identified with the New Phrygian word for woman (N-116): gen. sg. κναικο, acc. sg. κναικῶν while *anamaka* is probably borrowed from OPer. *anāmaka-*, name of a month (literally, 'nameless').

(iv) *Inscription from Kyolmen, Bulgaria* (see Beševliev 1965, 1966; Schmitt-Brandt 1967; Georgiev 1977, 121). Allegedly Thracian, it bears no resemblance to Thracian as represented by toponymical data and glosses. On the other hand, a few identifiable fragments as well as writing are extremely close to Phrygian. Suggested number Th-01. Transcription (interpunction replaced with blanks): (1) ebar [ylesas η e[glēs[ililolek a[. . .] (2) [iylas [-]ete[d] [yled eli] dakat[r]s (3) blabaης. The subject of the first line (presumably followed by a direct object) seems to be *ebar* (personal name?) while *egesti* may correspond to OPhr. 3d sg. fut. *egeseti* 'make, do' (P-04a). In the second line, *iyas* is identical with NPhr. gen. sg. fem. ιας, relative pronoun (N-116) while *dakatr* is easily identified with NPhr. 3d sg. med. (αδ)δακετορ, (α)δακετερ, (δα)κιτορ 'put' (n-36, 40, 63, 72) followed by *s* ~OPhr. *si*, *s* 'this' (M-01], P-06), *e(i)* ~ NPhr. ει, αι (*passim*). Finally, *blabaης* should be interpreted as 3d sg. aor. (as OPhr. forms in *-aes*, *-ais*) of a verb related to (or borrowed from?) Gk. βλόπτω, aor. ἐβλόβην 'stop, bar the way,' later 'harm, damage.' Tentative translation: "Ebar...made (this tomb?), of which...and installed this. (He) has barred the way."

(v) *Inscription from Sitovo, Bulgaria* (see Peev 1929; Rakeva-Morfova 1950; studied *de visu* by L.S. Bayun in 1989). Suggested number Th-02. A definitely genuine inscription on a smooth stone stripe carved in a rock. Old Phrygian writing abounding in ligatures. Not earlier than third century B.C. Transcription: (1) ài vixusin vixu iptiu imin iptin sai: ku ioi

[βα]χ[i]uàis imin ζi (2) n uīχusi. Phonetically, three features are worth notice: unstressed OPhr. -on(-) > u, -an > in (similar change in New Phrygian); between vowels, OPhr. -k- > χ, (also observed in late Old Phrygian); before i, OPhr. -t- > s, -d- > -ζ- (cf. E-01 above). Commentary: ài - conjunction 'if,' see (iv); viχusin viχu - figura etymologica reflecting IE *weikonti weikom, cf. *weik- 'holy, sacrifice': Goth. *weihs*, *weithan* (Pokorny 1959, 1128), viχusin, in contrast to viχusi, has a ν ἑφεκυσμιν; iptiu - acc. sg. adj. coordinated with viχu; imin - acc. sg. identical with OPhr. *iman* 'cult model, figurine,' NPhr. ιμον, cf. Hitt.*himma*- 'id.' (Bayun, Orel 1988a, 194); iptin - acc. sg. of a theonym, cf. Ἰπτα in Asia Minor, Hitt. ^D*He-pit* (from Hurrian), in apposition to imin; sai - dat. sg. fem. 'this,' cf. NPhr. σαι 'id.' (N-35, 69); ku - acc. sg. of a pronoun < IE *k^wom; ioi - dat. sg. masc. 'who, which,' cf. OPhr. yoi 'id.' (B-01), NPhr. ioi (N-86); βαχιν - acc. sg. of an adjective in *-yo- related to Old Phrygian theonym *vaki* (~ Gk. Βάκχυς, Lyd. *bakiva*-?); αἰσ -3 sg. aor. 'glorify, adore,' cf. OPhr. ζin- 'god,' cf. NPhr. δεο- 'id.' (G-117)(passim). Translation: "If (they) devoted to Ipta her figurine for this (goddess) and glorified something (related to) Vaki for him, (they also) devoted (or: adored) this god's figurine."

These inscriptions imply a radical transformation in our view of where and when Phrygian was spoken. Irrespective of a formula with which we choose to describe the linguistic situation in Thracia and Moesia (Thracian and Moesian as fairly closely related to Phrygian or as Phrygian dialects), the inscriptions (i) - (v) seem to belong to the same linguistic tradition. It is, therefore, reasonable to use "Phrygian" as a technical term. The word "Thracian" may be reserved for a different language(s) represented by Thracian glosses, toponymy and the inscription from Ezerovo. Thus, the Phrygian linguistic area in the second half of the first millennium B.C. includes territories on both sides of the Straits: Phrygia, Moesian regions in Anatolia and parts of Thracia (of the south of

Hebrus), a fact corroborated by ancient authors (Hdt. VIII, 73; Strab. VII, 295).⁶

2. Phrygian and South-east Indo-European

A number of grammatical features (including the augment) show that Phrygian is one of South-east Indo-European dialects and happens to be closely related to Indo-Iranian, Armenian, and Greek. The antique tradition (recently acquired by certain linguists, see Georgiev 1977, 223 and Diakonoff, Neroznak 1985, *passim*) considers Armenians to be Φρυγῶν ἄποικοι (Hdt. VIII, 73). Although this indication is of great importance, it only establishes the fact that (Proto-)Armenians and Phrygians were neighbors but says nothing of the linguistic relationship. Moreover, the recent attempts to show that Armenian and Phrygian are particularly close linguistically are not based on any positive evidence, thus, prove exactly the opposite.⁷

The present writer is proposing that Phrygian is, in fact, intimately connected with Greek and that Phrygian and Greek form a distinct subgroup within South-East Indo-European. The

6. Although Samothracian inscriptions are fragmentary and insufficient, they contain a few striking parallels with Phrygian. Cf. Samothracian *beka* 'bread (?)' ~ NPhr. βεκα, 'bread' indicated by Bonfante 1955).

7. The most important lexical isoglosses connecting Phrygian with Indo-Iranian and/or Armenian are: *akenas* (see note 1;) 3d sg. impf. *sideto* 'succeed, achieve' ~ Skt. *sādhati* 'id.' (cf. also note 1; Gk. ἰθὺς 'right, just'); acc. sg. *bagun* 'luck, happiness' ~ Skt. *bhāga-* 'id.' Av *baγa-* 'god,' OPer. *baga-*; αὐαρ, εὐαρ 'man, husband' ~ Arm *ayr* 'man,' Gk. ἀνὴρ 'id.' (note the prothetic vowel).

evidence consists of numerous lexical isoglosses as well as parallels observed in the morphology and, to a certain extent, in the historical phonology.⁸ Syntactical archaisms of Phrygian are described in Bayun, Orel 1990.

First, we may note briefly some of the striking coincidences in the morphology and word-formation: (1) In Old Phrygian two variants of gen. sg. of *o*-stems are found: *-oyo*, *-oio* < IE **-osyo* and *-ovo*, *-o* (phonologically, [o:] or [ool]) < IE **-oso*:. The same forms coexist in homeric Greek although the distribution of *-ου/-οιο* remains enigmatic.⁹ The situation in Phrygian is much more transparent: *-oyo*, *-oio* regularly appear in adjectives while *-oo*, *-o* is only possible with substantives as in *kakoio itovo* 'of the bad fate' (G-02), see Orel 1986. (2) The oblique cases of Gk. γυνή 'woman' are hardly derived from an expanded stem γυναικ- (hardly comparable with Arm pl. *kanay-k* 'women'). Its only exact parallel is found in NPhr. gen. sg. κναικο < **knaikos* ~ Gk. γυναικός, acc. sg. κναικον ~ Gk. γυναικᾶ. (3) Another case of a stunning parallelism has been noticed by Kretschmer (1932) in NPhr. 3d sg. impf. ισγεικετ 'keep' < IE **(e-)sghēk-et* corresponding to Gk. ἔσχηκε. (4) Greek formations in *-ευσ* (βασιλεύς, Cypr. nom. pl. Εδωλιεφες) may be compared with Old Phrygian nouns in *-en-ais* presumably derived from **-eu-s* (*-ais* also occurring in New Phrygian is not quite clear).

We can pass next to the full list of Greek-Phrygian lexical isoglosses. Below, Greek loan-words are not mentioned; dubious cases are noted with a question mark.

8. Cf. the development of IE **s* in Phrygian: it was preserved in the anlaut (where it was lost in Greek), auslaut and consonantal clusters but disappeared between vowels.

9. The complicated situation in Homeric Greek can hardly be explained semantically or metrically.

dat. sg. *adi/oi* (B-01). See above.

dat. sg. *aglavoy* 'brilliant, splendid' (E-01) ~ Gk. ἄγλαος < *ἄγλαφος (see Chantraine 1968, 12).

ακαλός 'bad' (N-30), ακκαλος (n-33). Maybe, originally 'not beautiful,' with an ἄ ἐπιτατικόν ~ Gk. καλός 'beautiful' (probably from *καλφος).

akenanogavos 'custodian of sepulchres' (M-Oia): composed of *akenas* 'sepulchre, monument' (W-07) and *-anog-avos*, nomen auctoris derived from a verbal stem 'manage, be in charge,' cf. Gk. epic perf. ἄνωγα 'order' (other Indo-European languages have no traces of **ō* in this root, see Chantraine 1968, 94; Pokorny 1959, 290). Myc. *a-no-ke-wa* 'title or occupation' (Py An 192) may be an exact equivalent of *-anogavos*.

? dat. sg. masc. *anato[y]* 'unpunished, innocent' (B-01) ~ Gk. ἄνοτος 'id.' either a loan-word or an example of Old Phrygian contraction *-*awa-* > *ā*.

3d sg. opt. *anegertoy* 'erect' ~ Gk. ἀνεγείρω 'arouse, erect.' In both languages the same prefix precedes the root with a prothetic **e-* absent in the Indo-European cognates (see Pokorny 1959, 390).

dat. sg. masc. *anepaktoy* 'not alien' (9B-01) ~ Gk. ἐπακτός 'strange, alien.' Parallelism of word-formation.

arkiaevais 'elder, official' (M-01a): derived from *arki-* ~ Gk. ἀρχή 'beginning, authority, power.' No immediate parallels outside Greek.

dat. sg. fem. *avtay* 'same' (W-01b), dat. sg. masc. αυτω (N-30), nom. pl. neutr. αὐτός (N-30) ~ Gk. αὐτός 'id.' No cognates outside Greek.

dat. sg. masc. *evtevey* 'just, right,' fem. *evteveyay* (B-02), dat. sg. masc. *anevtevey* 'unjust' (E-01) ~ Gk. εὐθύς 'id.' No convincing etymology (see Chantraine 1968, 385). The parallelism in the inflection is striking: *evtev-* : εὐθύς ~ *evteveya-* : εὐθε(φ)ῖα.

gen. sg. *e[v]vulio* 'good' (p-01), acc. sg. *eluln* (P-06), *ev-* in composites ~ Gk. ἐύς 'id.' < **esu-*. Different vocalism in

Hitt. *aššuš* and Skt. *su-*.

gen. sg. *kakoio itovo* 'bad fate' 9G-02) ~ Homeric Gk. (acc. sg.) *κακὸν οἶτον* 'id.' An important coincidence of archaic formulas. OPhr. *kako-* ~ Gk. *κακός* are isolated (with the exception of Alb. *keq* 'bad' < **kakynos*).

ke, particle preceding verbs in optative (W-01b) ~ Gk. *κε* (hardly related to Skt. *kām*, see Chantraine 1970, 507).

? acc. sg. *keneman* 'niche' (M-01b) ~ Gk. *κένεωμα* 'id.' (derived from *κενός* 'full'). Contraction in Phrygian or a loan word?

kermo[s] 'kind of a vessel' (G-104) ~ Gk. *κέραμος* 'vessel, jug.'

laua[...] 'people,' dat. sg. *lavay* (E-01) ~ Gk. *λαός* 'id.' probably also related to Hitt. *lahha-* 'war.'

? *lav[age]tas* 'military chief' (G-01), dat. sg. *lavagtaei* (M-01a), mistaken for **lavagetai* ~ Gk. *λαφαγέτιας* 'id.' Myc. *za-wa-ke-ta* (Py An 724, Un 718).

acc. pl. *μυνεις* 'wrath' ((N-69) ~ Gk. *μῆνις* 'divine wrath.' etymology unknown.

meneya, epithet of the Great Mother 9B-01) ~ Gk. (εὖ-) *μένεια* 'benevolence.'

acc. sg. *me[r]oun* 'part' (B-02) ~ Gk. *μέρος, -εος* 'id.' Both Phrygian and Greek words are *s-* stems.

? acc. sg. *μοικρον* 'small' (N-18), phonetically [mikran] ~ Gk. *μικρός* 'id.'

dat. sg. *mroy* (B-01), *μ-ρο* (n-58), gen. sg. *μροσ* (N-114). An abbreviation of the original **matrov(y)o-* < **mātrōw(y)om* 'temple of the Great Mother' ~ Gk. *τὸ Μίγτρον* (*ἱερόν*) 'id.', *τὰ Μητρῶα* (*ἱερά*).

acc. sg. *opito [n]* 'punishment, retribution' (B-01) ~ Gk. *ὄπις* 'divine vengeance, divine protection,' cf. *θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες* (Il. 16, 388). The suggested connection between *ὄπις* and IE **okʷ* (Chantraine 1974, 808) is not very convincing. The formation of OPhr. *opi-to-[n]* reminds of Homeric Gk. *Ὀπίτης*.

gen. sg. *oro* (G-02), *ορον* (N-47,92) ~ Gk. ὄρος 'mountain, height,' Myc. *o-re-i* (KN B 7034), *o-re-a2* (PY Ep 705). Parallel nominal formations (derived from **er-* 'move, rise').

ορουενος 'heaven' (N-32, 33, 34 etc.), loc. pl. *ουρνους* (N-69) < OPhr. *(*ν*)*orveno(i)si* ~ Gk. οὐρανός 'id.' The postulated prototype is *ῥ(ο)πανος* (Chantraine 1974, 838-839).

nom. pl. *ουελας* 'sun, heat of the sun' (N-42) ~ Gk. εἴλη 'id.' < **h₂λέα*, Lacon βέλα 'sun, sunrise' (Hes.), γέλαον 'dawn' (Hes.). Parallel formations in *-a*.

3d sg. pres. *ριδιτι* 'install, fix, establish' (N-116) ~ Gk. ἐρείδω 'id.' No parallels in other Indo-European languages.

σουβρα 'up to' (N-9) < OPhr. **sobra* ~ Gk. ὄφρα 'id.'

acc. sg. *tekmor[an]* 'vow, pledge' (P-04a), *τεκμορ* (N-116) ~ Gk. τέκμορ 'id.'

acc. sg. *telemi* 'inner room' (B-01) ~ Gk. θάλαμος, θαλάμη 'id.' (etymologically dubious, see Chantraine 1970, 419-420). NPhr. *θαλαμει* 'id.' (N-4) may be borrowed from Greek.

acc. sg. *τιαν* 'goddess' (N-14, 53, 99) ~ Gk. θεά 'id.' See *τιος*.

acc. sg. *τιητον* 'divine' (N-58), phonetically, [teyon] ~ Gk. θεῖος 'id.', Myc. *te-i-ja* (PY Fr 1202). Derived from an isolated Greek-Phrygian word for god (see below).

τιος 'god' (N-32, 33, 34 etc.) < OPhr. **te(y)os* ~ Gk. θεος 'id.', Myc. *te-o* (PY Eb 297, Ep 704) from **dhesos* or **dhwesos* (see Chantraine 1970, 430).

υκε 'not' (N-2) ~ Gk. οὐκ(ι) 'id.' No reasonable etymology.

? dat. sg. *vanaktei* 'ruler, king' (M-01a), acc. sg. *ουανακτον* (N-69) ~ Gk. ἄναξ 'id.' No reasonable etymology.

? dat. sg. masc. *venavtun* 'onese;f' (W-01b) ~ Gk. ἑαυτόν 'id.' Unique composite of IE **swe(m)* and *avt-* (see above). Myc. *wa-na-ka* (KN Vc 73 etc.). Phrygian is believed to be Greek loanword, see Chantraine 1968, 84.

dat. sg. *ζειραι*, *ζειρα* 'evil god, spirit' (N-12, 106) ~ Gk. φθείρω 'destroy, ruin' (hardly related to Skt. *ksarati* 'flow' as

suggested in Pokorny 1959, 487). NPhr. ζ is a substitution of *dg-* reflecting the initial consonantal cluster of **g^whdher-* as in ζμελως.

dat. pl. ζμελως, ζμελωσι 'chthonic deity' (N-21, 40, 63, 75 etc.) ~ Gk. χθαμαλός. The Indo-European source is **ǵh^dh^melos* (cf. also Lat *humilis*). NPhr. ζ is not a *satəm* development of *(dh)ǵh* but, presumably, stands for a group *dg* graphically substituted by ζ as in ζειραι (see above).

The above evidence seems to prove that Phrygian (spoken in a vaster area than it has been believed before) shares various lexical and grammatical innovations with Greek, much more numerous than the isoglosses connecting it with other South-East Indo-European languages (on Greek-Phrygian parallels in metrics and poetic language see Orel 1990b). The natural conclusion to be drawn from this observation is that Greek and Phrygian form a separate subgroup in the Indo-European taxonomy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bayun, L. S., V. E. Orel (Л. С. Баян, В. Э. Орёл)

1988a,b. "Язык фригийских надписей как исторический источник, I-II." Вестник древней истории 1: 173-200, 4: 132-168.

Bayun, L. S., Orel, V. E.

1988c. "The Moesian Inscription from Uyučik." *Kadmos* 27/2: 131-138.

Bayun, L.S., Orel, V.E. (Л. С. Баян, В. Э. Орёл)

1990. Фригийский язык. Nauka. Moscow.

Beševliev, V.

1965. "Inscription in unbekannter Sprache aus Nordbulgarien." *Glotta* 43/3-4: 317-322.

Beševliev, V.

1966. "Inscription in unbekannter Sprache aus Bulgarien."

- Linguistique balkanique* 11/1: 5-8.
- Bonfante, G.
1955. "A Note on the Samothracian Language."
Hesperia 101-109.
- Brixhe, C., M. Lejeune
1984. *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*, I-II. Paris.
- Chantraine, P.
1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* I-II.
Paris. Klincksieck.
- Detschew, D.
1960. "Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache." *Linguistique balkanique* 2: 145-213.
- Diakonoff, Igor M., V. P. Neroznak
1985. *Phrygian*. New York: Caravan Books
- Friedrich, Johannes
1932. *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*. Berlin.
- Georgiev, Vladimir (Владимир Георгиев)
1977. Траките и техният език. Sofia.
- Haas, Otto
1966. *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Sofia.
- Kretschmer, Paul
1932. "χθων" *Glotta* 20: 66.
- Neroznak, V.P. (Владимир П. Нерознак)
1978. Палеобалканские языки. Moscow: Nauka.
- Orel, V.E. (Владимир Е. Орёл)
1986. "Об одной греко-старофригийской изоглоссе: ген. сг. о-основ." Балканы в контексте Средиземноморья. Moscow. Pp. 169-171.
1990a. "К интерпретации двух старофригийских памятников." Балканские чтения I." Moscow: Nauka: Pp. 34-35.
1990b. "Новые материалы к изучению фригийского языка."

- Балто-славянские исследования. Moscow.
- Реев, А. (А. Пеев)
1929. "Новооткрит надписи в родопите" Известия на
Българския археологически Институт. 5/363-365.
- Pokorny, Julius.
1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. Bern -
München: Franke.
- Rakeva-Morfova, Z. (З. Ракева-Морфова)
1950 "Надписът при Ситово" Годиснак на Народния
Археологически Музей Пловдив 2: 242-243.
- Schmitt-Brandt, R.
1967 "Die thrakischen Inschriften." *Glotta* 45/1-2: 40-60.
- Schwyzer, E.
1939. *Griechische Grammatik I*. Munich.